

## Housing and Rental Licensing Code Changes Survey

<p>The city is adding the following six items to the rental licensing checklist(s) to be verified by a licensed inspector upon new license approval or license renewal: -Barbecue fire-safety requirements for multi-unit residential building decks and patios -Safety of stairs, decks, porches and balconies. -Portable fire extinguisher in multi-unit rental buildings. -Tenant access to the electrical circuit breakers for their unit. -Compliance with recently enacted state carbon monoxide law related to rental housing units. -Safety of electrical outlets and extension cord use. Do you think the addition of these items will enhance the program's emphasis on life-safety?</p>						
	Enhance life-safety	Enhance life-safety for the most part	Enhance life-safety but more could be included	Do not enhance life-safety	Rating Average	Response Count
What do you think? These items:	26.7% (36)	<b>48.1% (65)</b>	3.7% (5)	21.5% (29)	2.20	135
If you answered "more could be included" or "don't enhance life-safety," what criteria would you add to the safety checklist? Do you believe that any of the additions will not enhance life-safety provisions?						49
<i>answered question</i>						135
<i>skipped question</i>						1

<p>If you answered "more could be included" or "don't enhance life-safety," what criteria would you add to the safety checklist? Do you believe that any of the additions will not enhance life-safety provisions?</p>		
1	Tenant access to circuit breakers seems like common sense. I'm not sure what barbecue fire-safety means, but if I had to guess I'd guess that it would boil down to more restrictions on renters via landlord paranoia. Boo, hiss, etc.	Mar 8, 2010 7:32 AM
2	This is such a set up question it's ridiculous. How about does the cost warrant the added life safety? What the hell does safety of electrical outlets and extension cord use mean?	Mar 8, 2010 10:36 AM
3	Everytime you add rules there are unintended consequences. for example, from now on I will write into my leases that all bar-b-q units are strictly forbidden. Was that really your goal? Extension cord use??? How in the hell are you going to regulate that? Where is the provision to regulate allow/disallow pot growing rooms, grow lights, fans etc? Talk about potentially unsafe conditions. Tenants do things which landlords have absolutely no control over.	Mar 8, 2010 11:31 AM
4	It has not been demonstrated that any of these items is a current problem that needs to be fixed at great expense.	Mar 8, 2010 4:06 PM
5	This will just cost a lot of money and will have not even a negligible effect on safety. Also, this will be a burden to renters who will be faced with rent increases in an economic downturn.	Mar 8, 2010 4:39 PM
6	An informative booklet that explains the potential hazards of using a grill, extension chords, electric heaters or kerosene heaters, disabling smoke alarms, storing flammables near furnace or water heater, etc. Also to be included would be energy saving tips. The trick is how to get them to read it, perhaps they need to check off items being read when they sign their lease, or have some required stickers in key areas.	Mar 8, 2010 4:54 PM

If you answered "more could be included" or "don't enhance life-safety," what criteria would you add to the safety checklist? Do you believe that any of the additions will not enhance life-safety provisions?		
7	Also need fireplace, woodstove safety inspections or follow-through with chimney inspections; especially with regard to absentee owners and multiple family housing risks.	Mar 8, 2010 5:29 PM
8	I know there have been a few fires from propane grills but thats due to negligence. Also, most of those untis did not have sprinkler systems. I am not as concerned about people having grills, as buildings having those sprinklers. I think that should be a must in those big buildings. Retro-fit those places = lives and property can be saved if there is a fire. The grills, not a big deal if people are safe.	Mar 8, 2010 5:32 PM
9	If the city is already adding these, then how will the survey be used?	Mar 8, 2010 5:35 PM
10	Tenant education would do more than any or all of these.	Mar 8, 2010 5:46 PM
11	The BBQ requirement is restrictive and a detriment to quality of life. You shouldn't have to be rich or own your own home to be allowed to grill.	Mar 8, 2010 5:50 PM
12	Actually less could be included. The only thing that should be inspected (randomly) is that tenants don't have BBQ's on their decks, and any fines should be given to the tenant.	Mar 8, 2010 5:51 PM
13	This is a broad question for several very different and specific items. The way the question is worded it makes it sound like a decision to add these has already been made?? A rental housing license inspection should be for things that are under the control of the landlord/property manager. Barbecue and extension cord use are totally renter controlled and should not be included. Fire extinguisher TYPE is very important in fighting a fire and the tenants should pick these so they know what type of fire they are compatible with otherwise you can cause more injury and damage. CO detectors should be checked during a safety inspection. What does "safety of electrical outlets" mean specifically? Will older properties have to be rewired to meet this broad definition?	Mar 8, 2010 6:20 PM
14	Shitty poll design, putting 6 items in one question. BBQ fire safety and extension cord use should not be included, as they are not under the control of the landlord. If emphasis on life safety is a concern, portable fire extinguishers should be required in all rental housing, not just multi-unit. I agree with inspecting the safety of stairs, etc, and complying with the co2 detector laws. I don't see how the circuit breakers affect safety.	Mar 8, 2010 6:29 PM
15	I think maintaining secure buildings (fixing door and window latches) is also important (for example, our apartment's screens could be easily removed and someone could break into our apartment that way.	Mar 8, 2010 6:32 PM
16	Isn't there already a regulation for BBQ units in multi-unit rentals?  Adding provisions that require an intelligent response (portable fire extinguishers, accessible circuit breakers, extension cord use, etc) assumes that the renters are capable of rational decisions under stress. Given that many renters are young, college-age people, who are often impaired, and whose impairment often results in life-threatening situations, it is foolish in the extreme to think that they would think to use the fire extinguisher, or trip the breaker.  Requiring sprinklers in new construction would enhance life-safety. Having external breakers accessible to emergency personnel only would enhance life-safety. CO detectors work only if tenants can hear the alarm. When a tenant (or owner, for that matter) is seriously impaired through ingestion and abuse of various chemical substances, the CO detector will have little or no impact on life-safety.	Mar 8, 2010 6:43 PM
17	tenant education especially on fire safety will not be addressed through the rental inspection program little a building owner can do if tenants leave untended candles or have other unsafe behaviors ( house next door to my home burned out two summers ago because tenants left a candle burning ... )	Mar 8, 2010 6:45 PM
18	Provisions in effect are adequate.	Mar 8, 2010 7:06 PM

If you answered "more could be included" or "don't enhance life-safety," what criteria would you add to the safety checklist? Do you believe that any of the additions will not enhance life-safety provisions?		
19	Aren't these things already covered by the State or by existing local building codes?	Mar 8, 2010 7:19 PM
20	No matter how many regulations you add to the owner, you will not get the tenants to comply or even able to think about things.	Mar 8, 2010 7:19 PM
21	It is not so much these items as much as the other items that the City wants to do. The City should not have a say in the issue. If the housing stock is old, then the renters will determine the fate of the property. As a renter, I do not want to pay to upgrade someone else's house.	Mar 8, 2010 7:57 PM
22	This is an extremely difficult question to answer as it is currently written. You seem to be asking "how much do these proposed items enhance life-safety?" The question that matters, though, is "Does the life-safety benefit of implementing and inspecting these additional six items outweigh the cost?" For some of these items, the answer is no, and for others it is yes. I tend to err on the side of less regulation.... and given the ambiguity here the best answer is "do nothing."	Mar 8, 2010 8:03 PM
23	As an owner, I have no control over what a tenant does with extension cords unless I were to inspect the property every week, which is not feasible.	Mar 8, 2010 8:09 PM
24	less interference from the city government	Mar 8, 2010 8:15 PM
25	I have not noticed a major problem with safety issues in Boulder. Also, you can inspect today and things can change tomorrow. This is over-the-top. I didn't answer the question above because it is a loaded question.	Mar 8, 2010 8:49 PM
26	They all enhance life-safety, additional criteria might include requirements for tenant evacuation training, and individual unit fire extinguishers. Is there an incentive for installation of sprinkler systems that could also be included?	Mar 8, 2010 10:55 PM
27	Most rental units are unlicensed. Tracking down those would be much more effective- These additions will raise rental costs to the point where most cannot afford to live in Boulder.	Mar 9, 2010 12:22 AM
28	I don't believe singling out rental properties is for the benefit of safety only. More of a control issue with the City of Boulder. Owner occupied residences should be treated equally. This is like saying that tenants are not intelligent and are going to hurt themselves unless the City protects them.	Mar 9, 2010 1:44 AM
29	Fire extinguishers are not a good idea. Residents should call the fire dept and get out and get others out, they should not take the time to read instructions and try to put out the fire themselves. this is dangerous.	Mar 9, 2010 2:26 AM
30	Why just multi-unit buildings for fire extinguishers?	Mar 9, 2010 2:31 AM
31	Please do not bias the questions. I would like more of an overview regarding the enforcement of the existing laws and standards before attempting to create what is perceived to be new ones.	Mar 10, 2010 1:22 AM
32	Though barbecue use and extension cord use can be addressed as part of a lease, after occupancy of a new tenant, these items are entirely in control of the tenant, not the property owner. As such, I don't believe they are something that would be effective to inspect as part of a license renewal.	Mar 10, 2010 5:32 PM
33	I believe safety comes down to the common sense and maturity of your tenant. The current criteria on licensing checklists is already quite sufficient. The above won't stop drug/alcohol related accidents or fires.	Mar 10, 2010 8:09 PM
34	Location of water shut-off valve. Explanation of distinctive odor of natural gas. How to safely light a pilot light. Shoveling of sidewalks for safety of self and others. Dog leash and fence rules for safety of dog and others.	Mar 11, 2010 1:07 AM
35	Irrelevant issue	Mar 11, 2010 4:58 PM
36	This list makes sense, but nothing can guarantee tenants' common sense! If the International Code includes requirements for seismic activity threats, and floods, or other concerns that are not applicable to Boulder, I think it would be a total hassle to adopt it.	Mar 11, 2010 7:31 PM

If you answered "more could be included" or "don't enhance life-safety," what criteria would you add to the safety checklist? Do you believe that any of the additions will not enhance life-safety provisions?		
37	Here is the problem as I see it. Tenants tend to run extension cords where ever and when ever. It is a case of regulating lives too far. Safety of stairs, etc., is good but in a multi-family project you are punishing the owner who does not have control. If you are going this far you need to regulate all multi-family projects whether it be rental or owner occupied. Why have a fire extinguisher in one condo while the one next door has none?	Mar 14, 2010 2:25 AM
38	Enhancing life-safety occurs as a action of the unit occupant. It is the same as the example of whether a gun is responsible for killing a person, or the the person holding the gun is responsible. You can inspect and install all the bells and whistles that you want to, to make yourselves feel that you are making a unit more 'life safe', but none of it will do any good if you have unit occupants who are irresponsible or oblivious.	Mar 17, 2010 12:06 AM
39	I have to say "do not enhance" because the summary of the changes is so vague I can't really tell what the impact is likely to be. What exactly, for example, is the "recently enacted state carbon monoxide law"?	Mar 18, 2010 12:26 AM
40	That seems like common sense stuff to me.	Mar 18, 2010 1:00 AM
41	The existing licensing requirements are adequate and should not be changed.	Mar 18, 2010 1:42 AM
42	This is a non sensical question. Of course the city could have landlords inspect every single item in the property. It costs more money, but it would be safer. The question is, how important is it to check the safety of newer buildings that have already met construction code. Is the inspector going to check every deck in a complex for barbeque? When did the requirement for portable fire extinguishers get added, especially if the building is already sprinklered? Safety of outlets and extension cord use....what about the safety of stoves and cooking utensils.	Mar 18, 2010 1:51 AM
43	These requirements are already there.	Mar 18, 2010 1:58 AM

If you answered "more could be included" or "don't enhance life-safety," what criteria would you add to the safety checklist? Do you believe that any of the additions will not enhance life-safety provisions?		
44	<p>1. What good does a one to four year inspection do to keep barbeque grills off of multi unit building decks and patios? The barbeque dissappears the day of the inspection and returns the next. This is better left to the property owner and/or management company to monitor and to include a clause in their leases that tenants can't have them. Having an occasional rental inspection is a waste of time and money.</p> <p>2. What is your criteria for inspecting ythis item? The safety of stairs, decks, porches, and balconies is a subjective issue and better left between the property owner and their insurance company. If the system was built to code originally there should not be a mandate to make people retrofit or replace everytime the code changes.</p> <p>3. Multi-unit rental buildings are to some extent already inspected by the fire department for which they generally inspect for fire extinguishers as required. Again a waste of time and money by duplication.</p> <p>4. Newer multi family buildings do have electrical panels in the units and generally the older ones do as well if the units were seperately metered. Making legal units that share electrical service have their own panels is very costly and impractical and if not against the electrical code when built should not have to be changed. And no, tenants should not have free access to common mixed unit/use elctrical panels.</p> <p>5. If carbon monoxide detectors are required by state law a simple letter sent with the rental license stating they are required by law and the penalties involved should suffice. Tenants are the largest problem with these as they unhook them when the backup battery runs low and starts beeping. (personal experience) They need to be monitored by the owner and not by rental license inspection. A rental inspection is not going to make them work the next day or for the next year. Additionally carbon monoxide detectors in rental units are only required to be added when you have a change of tenants. How is the city to know if a change of tenants has occurred and at what time? Are they going to monitor/manage our leases too? Personally I have them in all my rentals, both in and out of the city, and in my house and believe the detector itself is a good idea. I just don't think it is something the city should meddle in if it is required by law already.</p> <p>6. Rental inspections already do something of an electrical inspection. How do you enforce the safety of extension cord use? Take it away from a tenant? Monitoring extension cord use is about the same a rental inspector inspecting for barbeque grills.</p>	Mar 18, 2010 2:17 AM
45	I would like to see what the requirements are - for example barbecue fire safety requirements, safety of stairs, decks, porches and balconies. Who is doing the inspection. Right now, the only inspector is the heating person. Will he do these new things or do we go back to city inspectors, or hire another inspector?	Mar 18, 2010 3:30 PM
46	I'm not sure "Tenant access to the electrical circuit breakers for their unit." is a necessary life-safety provision as long as SOMEONE has access to the breakers.	Mar 18, 2010 10:03 PM
47	All of the items will enhance "life-safety" to some extent but not to the point of being mandated. I would like to see the burning of candles, incense or any type of smoking be disallowed in a rental unit. This would enhance safety more in my opinion.	Mar 19, 2010 2:44 AM
48	But extension cord use is not under the control of the landlord. This is something that renters will implement without knowledge of landlord. So this element seems odd. Seems redundant to include items that are already enforced by HOAs (like Barbecue fire-safety requirements) or the state (carbon monoxide)	Mar 19, 2010 3:47 AM
49	BBQ Safety out of owner's control. Stair, deck, etc subjective and require engineer to determine. Extension cord use out of owner's control.	Mar 19, 2010 10:52 PM

## Housing and Rental Licensing Code Changes Survey

If the proposed updates are approved, city inspectors may arrange to meet you at your residence to perform a prescheduled random license inspection audit (to double-check rental licensing checklist(s) items were addressed).						
	Will enhance program consistency and effectiveness	Will have no affect on program consistency and effectiveness	Won't enhance program consistency and effectiveness	Will decrease program consistency and effectiveness	Rating Average	Response Count
Do you feel this change will enhance (or decrease) the program consistency and effectiveness?	35.3% (47)	17.3% (23)	27.8% (37)	19.5% (26)	2.32	1
If you answered "won't enhance" or "will decrease" program consistency and effectiveness, please explain below:						
	answered question					1
	skipped question					

If you answered "won't enhance" or "will decrease" program consistency and effectiveness, please explain below:		
1	I suppose inspections would probably have an impact on compliance. On the other hand, as a renter, I'd rather not have to deal with an inspection unless I'm in a position of needing to force a landlord's hand in terms of compliance.	Mar 8, 2010 7:32 AM
2	Who is going to pay for the cost of this additional "service"? All of these costs will be passed to the renter. Another example of talking affordability out of one side of your mouth and making it more expensive for the average girl.	Mar 8, 2010 10:36 AM
3	Who will get the fine if the tenant does not comply, and how are you going to repay landlords for this additional waste of time and energy?	Mar 8, 2010 11:31 AM
4	This is very inefficient to have the city inspectors double-checking the work of the city-approved contractors. It brings into question, then, why contractors are required to be used for inspections.	Mar 8, 2010 2:11 PM
5	Random checks are something that I am opposed to. One needs to have it scheduled for certain.	Mar 8, 2010 2:44 PM
6	I think the random inspection is not needed. The can have a scheduled non-random inspection. Or allow the Landlords to do their own inspections. It would save money to have less inspections and just inform the renters of the laws. Renters can be given a form to contact the City if they feel their land lords are not following the codes.	Mar 8, 2010 2:46 PM
7	things can be met at time of inspection, but not normal. Extention cord compliance inspection is a joke - stop trying to regulate everyones lives - just make sure tenants (and everyone) knows what is safe and what may not be - let people decide for themselves.	Mar 8, 2010 4:23 PM
8	It will just waste time and cost the taxpayers money.	Mar 8, 2010 4:39 PM
9	This is the only way to insure compliance.	Mar 8, 2010 5:29 PM
10	Micro managing does not reduce risk or enhance safety. It's just more red tape and another reason NOT to own in Boulder.	Mar 8, 2010 5:46 PM

If you answered "won't enhance" or " will decrease" program consistency and effectiveness, please explain below:		
11	All the unlicensed rentals will have all the unhandled problems that would offset the legal rentals improvements	Mar 8, 2010 5:57 PM
12	Current inspection frequency is sufficient. More is over-regulation which cost both city and business owner needless expense.	Mar 8, 2010 6:02 PM
13	Where is the data to show that these things will provide a safer environment for tenants or are these things the result of someone's "brainstorming"? More intrusive rules not based on data are a waste of time and tax payer and property owner's money. Added costs will be passed to the tenants so everyone suffers by ineffective rules.	Mar 8, 2010 6:20 PM
14	<p>Again shitty poll design. The phrasing of this question is essentially, "If you disagree with what we the city wants to do, you must explain yourself" Why no demand from those who agree with you? Are you really so arrogant to think that you understand all the "positive" reasons and only need explanations for the negatives?</p> <p>It will not increase effectiveness, as it will significantly increase the cost to both the city and the landlord. The audits are saying essentially "We don't trust that you took the required actions like we told you to" If you don't trust them, they why would a pre-scheduled audit, where the landlord has time to duck in and make changes, be any better?</p> <p>The term "may arrange" shows that the program would not consistently cover all units.</p>	Mar 8, 2010 6:29 PM
15	Don't bother renters with this - these "random compliance checks" are just more beaurocracy. Property management companies and owners should be responsible for this during "downtime" when no one is living in the property. So if this is enacted, it'd be best to check a minimal number of properties (randomly selected) for each management company/owner during lease-changing time so that inspections can be performed without inconveniencing tenants. Honestly, it seems like a bit of a waste of time and money to do these spot checks when it is just as easy for tenants to report problems to the city of boulder (like not having a fire extinguisher, etc) if these guidelines have not been followed by property managers.	Mar 8, 2010 6:32 PM
16	<p>I'm sorry. "Program consistency" means what? And how will "program effectiveness" be measured?</p> <p>What's the bottom line for the audit? Will licenses be denied as a result of "failing" the audit?</p> <p>Boulder has a laughable reputation for lax enforcement of all of its codes. How will this audit change that reputation?</p> <p>Bottom line, this is a meaningless question without definitions for consistency and effectiveness.</p>	Mar 8, 2010 6:43 PM
17	seems like a waste of city staff time	Mar 8, 2010 6:45 PM
18	Seems like my tenants and i will be inconvenienced so the city can double check the people they licensed to do the inspection.	Mar 8, 2010 6:59 PM
19	This would be an expensive and largely ineffectual process on top of the existing licencing process.	Mar 8, 2010 7:03 PM
20	Will encourage non-compliance with rental license requirements. (Avoiding the city)	Mar 8, 2010 7:06 PM
21	To impose an inspection on a renter, and not the dwelling owner, is way out of bounds. I don't know of a city regulatory agency that has evening and weekend hours, so you would require the renter to miss work/school to comply with your new regulation. Not acceptable.	Mar 8, 2010 7:19 PM

If you answered "won't enhance" or " will decrease" program consistency and effectiveness, please explain below:		
22	If the property owner has gone to the trouble to comply with the rental licensing program it seems a breach of privacy, both for the tenant and owner and a waste of time and resources for the city to re-check. Only so many inspectors are even allowed by the program; if the city doesn't trust the inspectors or process, then the program needs stricter standards.	Mar 8, 2010 7:25 PM
23	What is a "prescheduled random" inspection? That seems to be a contradiction in terms. Random inspections sound like a good idea.	Mar 8, 2010 7:36 PM
24	This already exists in the licensing program. Rather than waste time and resources to "double-check" existing licensed properties (which have to go through inspection every four years anyway) I'd rather see the City use these resources to finally do something about all the of the rental properties that are unlicensed and operating illegally in the City. These are the properties that give Landlords a bad reputation and pose a much bigger safety issue to renters and the community.	Mar 8, 2010 7:56 PM
25	I believe these services are handled in the private sector right now, and this update seems to suggest that the city inspection staff will become involved moving forward. I see that as a minus, because the competition in the rental license inspection market made it work really well. The city inspection staff is great and does a really good job. I would be concerned with adding to their already high workload and/or the city needing to raise license fees to a large degree to fund this new responsibility.	Mar 8, 2010 8:03 PM
26	less interference from the city government	Mar 8, 2010 8:15 PM
27	If they already have a license why do we need additional checks on the property? Everything should be up to compliance when the license is granted.	Mar 8, 2010 8:19 PM
28	Work with the inspectors in the first place so the job is done right the first time. This new ordinance will make Boulder look like a police state. Again, it will add more cost which will hurt tenants and home owners.	Mar 8, 2010 8:49 PM
29	You are making it so difficult for property owners, that I want to sell the property rather than have to put up with your hassles.	Mar 8, 2010 9:12 PM
30	A scheduling nightmare... arranging with tenants, taking off of work	Mar 9, 2010 12:22 AM
31	so long as there are penalties to non-compliance, such checks should enhance effectiveness, unless there are ways to get around these requirements. I don't know if there might be a risk of land owners who have features there for aesthetics, but not working.	Mar 9, 2010 1:12 AM
32	Will the cost of paying these inspectors be worth it?	Mar 9, 2010 1:23 AM
33	This is so foolish. I think rentals are being singled out. If you tried this with owner occupied properties you would be shouted down immediately. City of Boulder already over regulates.	Mar 9, 2010 1:44 AM
34	Overkill - invasion of privacy --- no other city even has rental inspection. the city already has the right to do additional inspections if there is a complaint.	Mar 9, 2010 2:26 AM
35	I see this as a proposal to check on whether you can trust your licensed inspectors or not. Suggest a random audit process. Licensing fees for inspectors or rental license renewal fees should include costs of inconvenience to landlords and tenants - reimburse them for their time to admit city inspectors to the premises.	Mar 9, 2010 2:31 AM
36	You may have a higher compliance rate with random license inspections but the actual employee cost of the enforcement program will not pay for itself. Why not just make it a requirement of the standard rental license inspection?	Mar 9, 2010 3:14 AM
37	Just give a regularly scheduled notice of inspection. Random inspections just add chaos and irritation to compliance.	Mar 9, 2010 3:02 PM
38	I don't like random,,,Just make it part of the rental licence process renewal process	Mar 9, 2010 3:29 PM



If you answered "won't enhance" or " will decrease" program consistency and effectiveness, please explain below:		
39	The current licensing is adequate, disturbing tenants to "double check" feels insulting and unnecessary. It would make me inclined to not provide any additional rental housing, as it's getting too onerous.	Mar 9, 2010 4:40 PM
40	Tenants frequently take batteries out of smoke detectors, unplug carbon monoxide detectors and use overloaded extension cords - the owner can only provide safety equipment but the tenants need to take responsibility also. Random inspections will not improve tenant behavior, and punishing the owner for irresponsible tenant behavior is not an answer.	Mar 9, 2010 9:17 PM
41	The inspection at the time of licensing, or license renewal is sufficient.	Mar 10, 2010 1:02 AM
42	Again, this is a biased question. Of course having standards enforced (to the extent they have not been met) will be beneficial. But to create added buerocracy unnecessary is a waste of money.	Mar 10, 2010 1:22 AM
43	For those of us who already keep our rental units in a safe condition, it simply represents a waste of time/money for us and for the inspector/city. Those who wish to ignore licensing checklist requirements intentionally will simply wait until they are audited, then fix the problem before the audit. This does not seem effective to me. If (an) inspector(s) is/are to be employed and paid for by the city/taxpayers, the city might consider having the inspections done by city inspectors from the beginning, instead of requiring property owners to hire possibly multiple private inspectors/technicians. This is one of the more cumbersome aspects of the licensing program.	Mar 10, 2010 5:32 PM
44	The more stringent your standards are for obtaining licenses, fewer property owners will go "legal" and obtain a license...which equals LESS money to Boulder.	Mar 10, 2010 8:09 PM
45	Do you mean effect, not affect?	Mar 11, 2010 1:07 AM
46	Random inspections don't treat all landlords equally.	Mar 11, 2010 3:07 PM
47	The license inspection program works for the vast majority of properties. Don't fix it if it ain't broke. Concentrate, instead of "random license inspections," on getting more/all rental properties licensed.	Mar 11, 2010 4:58 PM
48	Isn't there aready a reinspection program, to make sure the required repairs were performed in a timely manner? This random idea is a waste of time.	Mar 11, 2010 7:31 PM
49	You should handle this by policing your licensed inspectors better!	Mar 12, 2010 4:36 AM
50	"prescheduled random inspections" only increase stress and animosity between the City and property owners. This is adding another level of "policing" that will have a negative impact. The critical piece in improving tenant safety is in the education of the tenants themselves. THAT is what must be addressed--not punitive acts against landlords.	Mar 12, 2010 10:43 PM
51	I don't see how you can enforce some of these ideas when you have a condo that only the air space inside the unit is owned (check your legal descriptions of condos). Condo owners cannot change anything that affects the exterior of the building...we do not own the interior walls (insulation), windows can be replaced, however, cannot change the opening even though it might not be square and the window may not fit.	Mar 14, 2010 2:25 AM
52	I think this should be done at the time the landlord applies for their license renewal. The inefficiency of having landlord and auditor make an additional trip to the property is not worthy of the minor required items.	Mar 14, 2010 8:19 PM
53	Too much government involvement, and too many inspections. List the items as reminders, but forgo the inspections. These endless inspections are to address problems that don't exist.	Mar 15, 2010 6:51 AM
54	It may enhance the consistency of the program, but not the effectiveness for the same reasons I gave for question #2.	Mar 17, 2010 12:06 AM
55	Big-Brotherish. Will alienate more people than it brings into compliance. One check is enough. A double-check is superfluous and thus a waste of time and money.	Mar 18, 2010 12:26 AM

If you answered "won't enhance" or " will decrease" program consistency and effectiveness, please explain below:		
56	I've already been inspected. I'm current and up to date. I'm even in compliance with all of your proposed changes. Why waste my time and yours.	Mar 18, 2010 1:00 AM
57	This is unnecessary. The licensing program is renewed and re-inspected every 4 years, which is enough. The addition of more often inspections by city inspectors will cost the city and tax payers more money which is totally unnecessary.	Mar 18, 2010 1:42 AM
58	Really, is this a question that doesn't lead itself to an answer?	Mar 18, 2010 1:51 AM
59	This is bureaucratic and unnecessarily time consuming and costly.	Mar 18, 2010 1:58 AM
60	1. I am against the proposed updates being approved 2. The term "prescheduled random" is an oxymoron don't you think? 3. What is the difference in terms between "have no affect" and "won't enhance". It seems like both categories are the same.	Mar 18, 2010 2:17 AM
61	not consistent from person to person time should be spend on more important items for the city	Mar 18, 2010 2:27 AM
62	While I think that the tenants should be informed and fully aware of the six safety items in question, the property owner is the one who should be held responsible for enactment of these updates and should therefore be the one that needs to meet the inspector for the prescheduled random license inspection audit.	Mar 18, 2010 3:51 AM
63	This should be done when the required 4 year inspection is done only, not randomly.	Mar 18, 2010 7:28 AM
64	This would not be needed and redundant. Unless there are significant abuses to the current system, I think this will only drive up costs of licensing and therefore rents. If the inspectors are not doing the inspections properly, that should be addressed with the inspectors.	Mar 19, 2010 2:44 AM
65	These new items should be addressed within the cycle of rental license renewals. No need for random inspection audits. This is too intrusive and too time consuming. Many rental property owners are doing this to supplement income, it is not their primary "job" and the city inspection schedule for other things (like new furnaces) is so incredibly a waste of time ( you have to take a whole day off from work just to hang around the property until they decide to show up) The more intervention of city inspectors and the inconveniences involved in these visits on "city time" will just make more people go "underground" and not ever register with the city in the first place.	Mar 19, 2010 3:47 AM
66	Seems redundant ,if it is allready in the inspection.	Mar 19, 2010 4:53 AM
67	should be available, not make unexpected check ups	Mar 19, 2010 5:48 PM
68	This question is worded to mean the inspector will meet with the resident and not the owner.	Mar 19, 2010 10:52 PM

## Housing and Rental Licensing Code Changes Survey

Do you feel as a (renter/owner/operator) the ability to request and obtain rental licensing checklist(s) for your review will enhance (or decrease) the program effectiveness?					
	Enhance	No change	Decrease	Rating Average	Response Count
What do you think?	<b>48.1% (63)</b>	44.3% (58)	7.6% (10)	1.60	131
If you answered "decrease" please explain below:					24
<b>answered question</b>					<b>131</b>
<b>skipped question</b>					<b>5</b>

If you answered "decrease" please explain below:		
1	I assume you will provide us with rules and regulations, rather than the current system which always seems to have new random unknown requirements that need fixing.	Mar 8, 2010 11:31 AM
2	Yes I think the renters should have the checklist. And it should be given to them with the lease (just as the lead paint information papers are sometimes given when legally required.	Mar 8, 2010 2:46 PM
3	The program comes at the wrong time. This will cost a lot of money which people do not have in the current economy.	Mar 8, 2010 4:39 PM
4	I'm not sure what this means.	Mar 8, 2010 5:12 PM
5	Excellent and recommend electronic listserv for renting community.	Mar 8, 2010 5:29 PM
6	Making the whole process more complicated does not help anyone.	Mar 8, 2010 5:46 PM
7	Could you write any more of a push poll? How is knowing each sub-section of what it took to get licensed pertinent? What matters is if the landlord/unit is a licensed rental or not. Knowing each of the sub-entries that they passed would not tell a potential renter any more than knowing the overall pass fail criteria. It would be a waste of money.	Mar 8, 2010 6:29 PM
8	Nowhere do I see any provision that this "audit" is voluntary. Why do you say "the ability to request and obtain checklist(s) for your review"? As you describe the program, it will be mandatory to have the audit performed before being allowed to renew a rental license.  And, once again, what is the measure of "effectiveness"?	Mar 8, 2010 6:43 PM
9	The ability to get checklists already exists	Mar 8, 2010 7:03 PM
10	It is pretty easy to get a checklist now, so I don't really understand the question. Is this a new feature or requirement?	Mar 8, 2010 8:03 PM
11	I am assuming you are referring to a check list that shows how a rental property needs to comply with regulations? If so, that is a no brainer, because the other option is to keep everyone guessing until an inspector come to your property, and then has to come back again when they tell you all the things you need to change.	Mar 8, 2010 8:19 PM
12	I could care less about your mandates! I feel that responsible owners and renters got along just fine before you became involved!	Mar 8, 2010 9:12 PM
13	The more regulations and costs will reduce the availability of affordable rentals. As an owner of a single house that we rent these costs and hassles will force us to sell the house.	Mar 9, 2010 12:22 AM

If you answered "decrease" please explain below:		
14	Tenants should be able to verify information from inspections and complain if it appears that inspections were improperly done.	Mar 9, 2010 2:31 AM
15	Again, the cost benefit does not outweigh the trouble it would be to format and provide this information	Mar 9, 2010 3:14 AM
16	We do this now, and we have rental inspections now. What are you trying to change?	Mar 10, 2010 1:22 AM
17	As a property owner, I know I keep my properties in good, safe condition. If there is a checklist, I was involved in having it completed, so I am already aware of the information it contains.	Mar 10, 2010 5:32 PM
18	The cost of a license should also include information and paperwork help for landlords to stay in compliance. Most landlords in Martin Acres own just one rental property and are their own managers.	Mar 11, 2010 1:07 AM
19	Irrelevant issue	Mar 11, 2010 4:58 PM
20	I've always received a checklist, prior to review, it's essential.	Mar 11, 2010 7:31 PM
21	It will decrease the effectiveness because it will cost more city personnel and more requirements for property owners and managers that is unnecessary. The rental licensing requirements are already known by managers and owners and it is adequate.	Mar 18, 2010 1:42 AM
22	Owners and managers are fully informed.	Mar 18, 2010 1:58 AM
23	I checked decrease because there wasn't a category for being apposed to the program. I find the the wording of the question gives the responder no out. Of course if the program is instituted (to which I am opposed), as a property owner I would want the checklist. Who wouldn't?	Mar 18, 2010 2:17 AM
24	What does this mean? You can already get rental licensing checklists.	Mar 19, 2010 3:47 AM

## Housing and Rental Licensing Code Changes Survey

Do you think the addition of a complaint-based component to the rental licensing program would enhance (or decrease) the program effectiveness?					
	Enhance	No change	Decrease	Rating Average	Response Count
What do you think?	<b>37.7% (49)</b>	36.9% (48)	25.4% (33)	1.88	130
If you answered "decrease" please explain below:					48
<b>answered question</b>					<b>130</b>
<b>skipped question</b>					<b>6</b>

If you answered "decrease" please explain below:		
1	What does complaint-based mean? Tenants can complain?	Mar 8, 2010 10:36 AM
2	The entire rental program should be complaint based only. This however, does allow retribution from neighbors, but only penalizes landlords when tenants are not good neighbors.	Mar 8, 2010 11:31 AM
3	I think the complaint-based system again calls into question the use of city-approved contractors. If they are doing their jobs, their should not be a need for a complaint-based component. I would see tenants using a complaint or the threat of a complaint as leverage against a landlord.	Mar 8, 2010 2:11 PM
4	I believe that a complaint-based component to the rental licensing program would decrease the program's effectiveness provided that random license inspection audits are performed. Such a component is duplicative, and probably would unnecessarily increase the workload of city employees dealing with tenant complaints which do not arise from the rental licensing requirements. This cost would definitely be passed along to renters via increased rents or fees.	Mar 8, 2010 2:34 PM
5	I think this should be the main way the program runs	Mar 8, 2010 2:46 PM
6	it would have an adversal impact on tennant/owner relationships.	Mar 8, 2010 3:37 PM
7	It cost money and increases bureaucracy.	Mar 8, 2010 4:39 PM
8	No answer given. I need a definition of "a complaint-based component"...	Mar 8, 2010 5:03 PM
9	Critically necessary.	Mar 8, 2010 5:29 PM
10	I think given the number of renters and turnover, you will get a ot of complaints that are not applicable and will greatly burden and cost the system.	Mar 8, 2010 5:35 PM
11	People like to whine when there is no problem. Would waste time responding to non-issues.	Mar 8, 2010 6:02 PM
12	Could you write any more of a push poll? This would significantly increase cost for the city, and duplicate existing methods of dealing with rental problems.	Mar 8, 2010 6:29 PM
13	Boulder has a large number of complaint-based "quality of life" codes.  Bottom line, most people will not file a complaint for fear of retaliation. Boulder PD and EZEO do not protect complainants identity, and retaliation has been a fact of life on Uni Hill for many years once the complainants' identities are revealed to the allege3d violator. I am not talking about "confronting your accuser" in court, but telling the violator first thing, before any charges are ever filed, who made the complaint.	Mar 8, 2010 6:43 PM
14	Encourages hostility/conflict with neighbors and busybodies. Complaints are already possible.	Mar 8, 2010 7:06 PM

If you answered "decrease" please explain below:		
15	If the inspection doesn't meet city requirements; then there should be opportunities to re-dress.	Mar 8, 2010 7:25 PM
16	This question is worded poorly. Explain what a "complaint-based component" means.	Mar 8, 2010 7:48 PM
17	this already exists doesnt it?...what is so different about this than the current system???	Mar 8, 2010 7:56 PM
18	I am pretty sure that this already exists. I've called the City before about my old landlord.	Mar 8, 2010 7:57 PM
19	Tenants can currently look to see if the landlord holds a current rental license. This should probably be enough in my opinion. I would tend to fear the scenario where a tenant files nuisance complaints. We have some pretty strict laws around this already in Boulder, (nuisance noise, all the EZEO stuff) why add more to the fire? Will the complaint response staff time be incorporated into the license fees? If so, yowza.	Mar 8, 2010 8:03 PM
20	I could not find reference to this in your documents. If it means what I think it does, I'm not sure it's a good idea. If every effort is made to keep a unit in good condition, but your tenant feels like complaining to be vindictive, this could be a no-win situation for all involved.	Mar 8, 2010 8:09 PM
21	the program is a violation of private property rights	Mar 8, 2010 8:15 PM
22	I think you need to offer more information about this question, and explain what & what compliant based is going to work.	Mar 8, 2010 8:19 PM
23	Doesn't this exist now?	Mar 8, 2010 8:49 PM
24	You are forcing people out of the rental business!	Mar 8, 2010 9:12 PM
25	What does this mean? Inspections are only made when there is a complaint?	Mar 8, 2010 10:09 PM
26	We have very good student renters in the past, there have been some who have been vindictive and would have abused the system with false complaints	Mar 9, 2010 12:22 AM
27	However it could lead to increased costs that are beyond the benefit.	Mar 9, 2010 1:23 AM
28	We already have this -- would whoever made out this survey please educate themselves more!	Mar 9, 2010 2:26 AM
29	Yes. As long as it is based on the issue of whether an inspector properly noted conditions in the unit. This provision could be open to spite. Perhaps there should be a penalty if the tenant falsely accuses the owner or inspector of improperly conducting the license acquisition or renewal.	Mar 9, 2010 2:31 AM
30	This would create an adversarial relationship between Landlords and tenants	Mar 9, 2010 3:29 PM
31	Tenants and other property owners already have venues for raising complaints to the city about rental properties and receiving remediation. Why does there need to be another component to the licensing process? The condition of the property at the rental inspection is a clear, quantitative way to assess if a property meets the standards for housing tenants - what is a complaint component going to add?	Mar 9, 2010 9:17 PM
32	There is an existing body of law that covers tenant-landlord relationships. Any effort to expand that can only lead to issues and agencies at cross purposes. Tenants must have a venue for complaints and it already exists.	Mar 10, 2010 1:22 AM
33	It seems as if the City already has landlord-tenant mediation structures in place and would just be adding redundant procedures in this case, representing a waste of time/money. I have always believed that as long as I keep my properties in good, safe condition, and address concerns brought up by my tenants, there would be no need for such a system.	Mar 10, 2010 5:32 PM
34	It is frustrating to be a good landlord who follows all the rules and have houses next to your own rental that cheat the students and let the place get rundown and just collect rent. We have had to help many students negotiate their rights with their landlords. (Mainly in the house right next door.)	Mar 11, 2010 1:07 AM

If you answered "decrease" please explain below:		
35	There is already a complaint-based component to the program -- Adding more capabilities of people to complain about everything in Boulder will just make Boulder a nastier place to live.	Mar 11, 2010 4:58 PM
36	Complicates things, to have to have a complaint department. Inspectors would have to become policemen. Isn't there a mediation board already in place, to deal with tenant/landlord disputes?	Mar 11, 2010 7:31 PM
37	In the wonderful world of perfect we would not have tenants file complaints when they have just received a notice of rent increase. I don't mean complaints about the rent but rather complaints about some perceived imperfection with their rental home. This idea could be used to harrass owners who have notified tenants of some violation of the lease agree or residential rules. I think this is an absolute can of worms that you don't want to take the top off of.	Mar 14, 2010 2:25 AM
38	You already have a complaint based system.	Mar 17, 2010 12:06 AM
39	Same reason as above. Big-Brotherish. Encourages a tattletale mentality and will waste time and money. Somebody's got to field and respond to the complaints, right? And those people have got to be paid, right? Just concentrate on doing a thorough inspection and follow-up check and let it go at that.	Mar 18, 2010 12:26 AM
40	A complaint-based component will cost the city more time and personnel and money and bureaucracy which is unnecessary. It will be required to prove the complaints are justified, which again would take more personnel and time on both the part of the city and the property owners and managers, as well as the tenants.	Mar 18, 2010 1:42 AM
41	This can be used frivolously and vindictively.	Mar 18, 2010 1:58 AM
42	We do not need another forum. There are already tenant/landlord mediation groups in the city and other legal avenues. We do not need the city to institute another one to spend money investigate every frivolous complaint. I am under the impression that the complaint based component is geared towards complaints made by tenants? Are you also going to investigate landlord complaints against tenants who run contrary to the regulations?	Mar 18, 2010 2:17 AM
43	Property owners as a whole are infamous for ignoring complaints from tenants. In one recent case, a home caught fire and was partially destroyed on account of an electrical short. The property owner had consistently ignored complaints from his tenants prior to the fire. Including some sort of accountability or requirement on the part of the property owner to acknowledge and respond appropriately to tenant complaints regarding the property are a wise idea. Of course there should be language included about pestering and unsubstantiated complaints.	Mar 18, 2010 3:51 AM
44	Disgruntled tenants will use this as a weapon to retaliate against property owners and jack up the cost to the City for investigation. Needed staffing changes will drive higher government costs, even if the complaints are frivolous. Inspectors will be running to and fro chasing many "complaints" that are ghosts which were created by uninformed complainants.	Mar 18, 2010 6:27 AM
45	There are already processes in place for complaints, etc. If this is implemented it should be for both tenants and owners to complain.	Mar 19, 2010 2:44 AM
46	Those of us who follow the rule don't need to be policed like this. And those who do not will simply drop out of the licensing program and thus there will be no oversight.	Mar 19, 2010 3:47 AM
47	It might lead to a breakdown in the tenant / landlord relationship , outside of the lease.	Mar 19, 2010 4:53 AM
48	There is already a process in place to handle tenant-owner disputes, so this redundant.	Mar 19, 2010 10:52 PM

## Housing and Rental Licensing Code Changes Survey

<p><b>As proposed, the price of rental licensing inspections (license renewal inspections occur every four years) will likely increase due to the enhanced checklist items. Will this have any affect (positive or negative) on you as a renter/owner/operator? Please note: The additional costs related to the proposed checklists updates would be absorbed by the owner/operator per the license renewal but could potentially be passed along to renters via increased rents or fees.</b></p>					
	Positive	No change	Negative	Rating Average	Response Count
What do you think?	10.7% (14)	12.2% (16)	<b>77.1% (101)</b>	2.66	131
Please let us know if you have any additional thoughts about this question:					95
	<b>answered question</b>				<b>131</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>				<b>5</b>

Please let us know if you have any additional thoughts about this question:		
1	I don't see any reason to expect that this wouldn't come out of my pocket eventually.	Mar 8, 2010 7:32 AM
2	Of course these costs would be passed to the renter. "Potentially" - affordability? Please.	Mar 8, 2010 10:36 AM
3	Potentially passed on?? Who are you kidding. Wake up.	Mar 8, 2010 11:31 AM
4	This will be positive for renters, as non-conforming properties will be removed from the rental pool through license revocation.	Mar 8, 2010 2:34 PM
5	For small property owners, this is an additional hoop that adds to their cost.	Mar 8, 2010 2:44 PM
6	I do not think it will be that much more money. What is proposed on the check list does not seem all that much more of a burden.	Mar 8, 2010 2:46 PM
7	This will increase the cost of living in Boulder.	Mar 8, 2010 3:38 PM
8	I'll raise the rent to cover the expense.	Mar 8, 2010 4:06 PM
9	As a property owner/landlord increased costs are negative, but the benefits of the proposal seem larger than the costs.	Mar 8, 2010 4:09 PM
10	This wording is lame. The costs related may be paid by the owner/operator (which is what it should say) but in the long term of course the cost has to be in the rent - this is fundamental economics. Renting in Boulder is already more expensive than most anywhere else. Boulder city says it wants more low cost housing, and then they layer more laws that make housing more expensive - get real!	Mar 8, 2010 4:23 PM
11	This ridiculous law only serves to increase government size at a time when it is not necessary and will make it even more difficult for people to afford to live here.	Mar 8, 2010 4:39 PM
12	This is an opportunity to have insurance rates reduced for owners who comply with the new proposals, just like security systems do on your auto policy.	Mar 8, 2010 4:54 PM
13	rent will go up to cover it	Mar 8, 2010 4:55 PM
14	The choice of "potentially be passed along" I feel is wishful thinking, "will be passed along" seems more likely given the rental populations demographic make up.	Mar 8, 2010 4:55 PM
15	Increased costs will definitely be passed on to renters	Mar 8, 2010 5:28 PM



Please let us know if you have any additional thoughts about this question:		
16	Plan to offset licensing costs by energy efficiency compliance makes all this a better total package for cash strapped owners as well as deserving renters.	Mar 8, 2010 5:29 PM
17	You cannot pass this cost on to a renter. It is not their fault the owner wasn't up to code. This is an owners expense 100%	Mar 8, 2010 5:32 PM
18	Of course it will have an effect.... someone has to pay the costs and it is unlikely we can always assume the renter will pay	Mar 8, 2010 5:35 PM
19	Of course the costs will be passed on to the tenant. It already takes five years for a rental to cash flow and you want to make it more expensive.	Mar 8, 2010 5:46 PM
20	I am currently upside down \$300 a month on our rental property. The current tax laws don't allow you to 'write this off' if your rental property when it is considered 'passive rental income'. The only reason that I don't sell the place is that I would take a beating on it, and I am hoping that it works out in the long run. The last thing I need is the Boulder bureaucracy performing their usual swindling tactics.	Mar 8, 2010 5:51 PM
21	The time required for addressing the additional items is minimal and should not require and increase in the licensing fee. Passing these costs on to renters is not valid as the market may not allow the additional rent. This with other costs of the "Smart Regs" may push some landlords out of the market and reduce the number of rentals available, thus raising rents across the board. With the present economy this will have a negative effect. We should support the economy not squash it.	Mar 8, 2010 5:52 PM
22	It is very disconcerting that legal landlords will be monitored and penalized more while unlicensed rentals go ignored. The city mgr said the city doesn't have resources to go after criminals in this area but apparently it does have the resources to target legal landlords.	Mar 8, 2010 5:57 PM
23	I would pass any increased expense on to increased rent. This hits the people who can afford it least.	Mar 8, 2010 6:02 PM
24	It only stands to reason that an increased cost will have a negative effect on owners and operators, and ultimately tenants.	Mar 8, 2010 6:03 PM
25	Is the added cost to the property owner/renter and government/tax payers worth it in terms of safety returns? Again, where is the data to support this kind of change or is this someone's "good idea"??	Mar 8, 2010 6:20 PM
26	Adding a check box for a CO2 detector, fire extinguisher, or safe stairs is great, that is a reprint on some papers and new training. It directly addresses safety concerns that should be a part of basic licensing. Providing checklists, organizing a complaint department, spot checks, and other proposed actions are just program bloat. They do not affect the basic safety of the rental stock in the city.	Mar 8, 2010 6:29 PM
27	No one wants more red tape! Leave the program alone unless there has been serious reason to call into question the ability of landlords to provide safe housing for their tenants. These things should remain between landlords and tenants unless there is a serious problem, which tenants can bring to the proper officials if necessary. Spot checks and increasing red-tape is just a pain and a waste of resources. Rent is high enough in Boulder already, so let tenants be their own advocates and bring up concerns if they have them.	Mar 8, 2010 6:32 PM
28	You gave the reason. The costs will almost certainly be passed along to the tenant. No landlord is going to absorb those costs, since they will go into effect across the board. Nobody likes to increase rent without a corresponding increase in benefits to the renter.	Mar 8, 2010 6:43 PM
29	--have thought inspections in the past were "nit picky". This is likely to get worse under the new program.	Mar 8, 2010 6:45 PM
30	Owners will likely pass on this charge to the renter.	Mar 8, 2010 6:45 PM
31	I am an owner, so of course I do not want to pay higher inspection fees. Last time I paid \$150 for about a half hours work (not counting travel) and they found nothing that needed attention. Most of the items on the enhanced checklist do not take long to inspect.	Mar 8, 2010 6:59 PM

Please let us know if you have any additional thoughts about this question:		
32	The cost/benefit ratio of the existing inspections is already poor. This would likely increase the already large beaurocracy with no material improvement to the process and just drive up Boulder rents further.	Mar 8, 2010 7:03 PM
33	Again will discourage compliance. Too intrusive to business. Will encourage mom and pop who own one or two rentals to sell out into the market. Will reduce availability of free standing rental by locals and encourage large corporate rental blocks like the CU dorms that were built to discourage local business. Money goes out of community.	Mar 8, 2010 7:06 PM
34	rents will increase. already too high for most average renters.	Mar 8, 2010 7:08 PM
35	Increased fees could "potentially be passed along to renters?" Are you serious? Any increase in fees/mandates will CERTAINLY be passed on to the renter. Economics 101 - the end user pays the taxes.	Mar 8, 2010 7:19 PM
36	I have owned my property for 18 years and I still do not get enough rent to cover expenses. Rent is \$965. Mortgage is \$930, homeowners dues are 222.48, taxes are 78.17 and insurance is another \$20 a month. Just where do you expect the money to come from? I should just give the property and all of its expenses to the city and let them sort out how to pay for their increased regulations	Mar 8, 2010 7:19 PM
37	I hope there are penalties if people to not comply!	Mar 8, 2010 7:23 PM
38	The inspectors already charge a fortune for the inspections; They should charge by the hour instead of lump sums for a half hour visit to the property. Also, units that are individually owned in a complex should be allowed to have association certificates that meet the inspections for shared boilers and many of the new items proposed, such as stairways & balconies, fire extinguishers etc. It is ridiculous that every owner has to pay for the same inspection.	Mar 8, 2010 7:25 PM
39	This question, and # 4, exclude anyone but renter/owner/operators from answering. And yet they affect neighbors and Boulder residents in general. Why is our input unwelcome?	Mar 8, 2010 7:36 PM
40	Rent is high enough as it is. The fact that landlords will potentially pass this extra cost on to the renters is not attractive.	Mar 8, 2010 7:40 PM
41	It is already very expensive to own & operate property in Boulder, this will just be one more cost that will get passed along to renters, it will result in increased rents and renters will be negatively affected.	Mar 8, 2010 7:56 PM
42	All of these things that the city wants to do will be passed to the renters, why do you think that the renters want nothing to do with this?	Mar 8, 2010 7:57 PM
43	Landlords will attempt to pass these fees along if the market will bear it. An increase in expenses without a commensurate increase in revenues *does* lower the value of a rental property. It is important to remember that rental rates are already pretty high in Boulder due to a constraint of supply, and this could be tipping point.	Mar 8, 2010 8:03 PM
44	Obviously this would affect us as owners, requiring yet more money to be paid out and I don't think this is something that could or should be passed on to the tenants.	Mar 8, 2010 8:09 PM
45	I will be selling my rental properties in the City of Boulder	Mar 8, 2010 8:15 PM
46	I think that with anything, when costs go up services usually go down. And in this case services will probably gown down and costs to renter will go up. Nothing is ever "absorbed".	Mar 8, 2010 8:19 PM
47	Will lead to better safety in rental units. These are things that rental units should have anyway.	Mar 8, 2010 8:20 PM
48	Increasing costs when the benefits are questionable is a negative. Again, what problem are we trying to address?	Mar 8, 2010 8:49 PM
49	I will either pass them on to the renter or sell the property.	Mar 8, 2010 9:12 PM
50	Boulder is already expensive enough to begin with - these changes may be practical and useful, but it seems like it will certainly raise the already exorbitant rent around here.	Mar 8, 2010 11:46 PM

Please let us know if you have any additional thoughts about this question:		
51	With this "enhancement" we will be forced to raise the rent. The next energy savings part of the plan will force us to sell our home.	Mar 9, 2010 12:22 AM
52	If the cost goes to the renter, it will deter renters like myself from wanting these checks (cash-strapped college-kids).	Mar 9, 2010 1:12 AM
53	This is going to be just another additional burden to property owners and will make it that much harder for young families to live in the City of Boulder. Rich parents of college students will be ok with paying more for rent but this will badly hurt the low income families that are still trying to live here.	Mar 9, 2010 1:44 AM
54	We don't need to do anything to further increase the cost of housing.	Mar 9, 2010 2:26 AM
55	Housing costs will rise, but life safety will be improved. We rent a single family house. Current economics are poor and getting worse - rent and maintenance costs do not cover the cost of mortgage/insurance/taxes. We did this project to preserve a small cottage in a neighborhood where it would certainly be scraped. From an energy perspective a new house would be much more efficient, but at the cost of neighborhood character. One casualty of of this program will be such investments. But these are certainly the minority of rental situations in the city?	Mar 9, 2010 2:31 AM
56	All costs associated with this program will be passed on to renters. Not only the cost of the rental license but also the cost of bringing rental properties into compliance with the increased standards. This substantial cost is in direct conflict with the stated goals of affordable housing initiatives that city council members are in support of.	Mar 9, 2010 3:14 AM
57	additional cost, but probably no changes to the rental. why the cost for another 5 minutes of checking?	Mar 9, 2010 4:58 AM
58	Costs would be passed onto renter to the extent possible. The inspection costs could likely be passed on in full, but the compliance costs may not. This will reduce the value of the real estate.	Mar 9, 2010 3:02 PM
59	Rents WILL go up..	Mar 9, 2010 3:29 PM
60	In this current economic situation any additional costs are not warranted. Especially since the city is ignoring all the unlicensed units. It's really so unfair to add more requirements on those who are following the law. It will encourage units to not comply at all.	Mar 9, 2010 4:40 PM
61	Nothing in life is free. If my landlord has to pay I know he will pass the fee on to me.	Mar 9, 2010 4:44 PM
62	It is a tough market for everyone. Increasing fees may be passed on to the tenant, but would most likely be absorbed by the owner. Many of us are already struggling.	Mar 9, 2010 5:27 PM
63	It will have a negative effect on rents in Boulder, because the cost will be passed on to the tenants. Last year I lost a months rent for installing backflow prevention devices in a rental, and now have to pay for an annual inspection on that in addition. Every time you increase the burden on the owner, you are going to increase the burden on the tenant up. At some point owners will become so fed up with all the business unfriendly regulations in Boulder and sell their properties.	Mar 9, 2010 9:17 PM
64	The costs have to be passed on to the renters. Investors buy real estate as an income stream. There is no sense in being a landlord if you only break even on the deal. There will be no affordable rentals if you continue to add these rules and regulations that increase the operating costs.	Mar 10, 2010 1:02 AM
65	Please see comments above.	Mar 10, 2010 1:22 AM
66	RENTS ARE SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER IN BOULDER THAN OTHER SIMILAR SIZED CITIES IN COLO. PASSING ADDITIONAL COSTS ALONG TO RENTERS WILL ONLY WORSEN THE EXISTING PROBLEMS WITH HOUSING COSTS IN BOULDER, BUT LAND LORDS WILL TRY ANY HOW.	Mar 10, 2010 3:31 PM
67	As a property owner, particularly a small volume one (three condos), any cost increases I have must be passed on to renters, as my margins are very small. The City's desire for affordable housing doesn't seem to reconcile with this concept of increased costs.	Mar 10, 2010 5:32 PM

Please let us know if you have any additional thoughts about this question:		
68	It only makes me consider renting without a current license, and yes, you are hurting the renters b/c if these proposals PASS, rents will increase tremendously.	Mar 10, 2010 8:09 PM
69	Many rentals are not licensed in our neighborhood (Martin Acres) and I am afraid this would increase.	Mar 11, 2010 1:07 AM
70	Badly worded question. Should be "agree" or "disagree" answers.	Mar 11, 2010 3:07 PM
71	Anything that causes property management to increase will have a negative effect, because we can't just raise the rent every time some bureaucrat decides to impose more regulations. I am all in favor of the property licensing program because it has eliminated some substandard housing, but the program needs to be done carefully and with the minimum amount of regulations.	Mar 11, 2010 4:58 PM
72	Most of the enhanced checklist would not apply to my little rental house, unlike the multi unit properties, so the increased fees would be a burden. Perhaps you could scale the fee to the property size?	Mar 11, 2010 7:31 PM
73	It appears that it may surprise you that landlords actually try to be profitable. Of course it is a negative to us that you are raising our costs!	Mar 12, 2010 4:36 AM
74	In the last 30 years of being a resident/owner of property in Boulder, I have seen that increased regulations have forced more and more property owners to "go underground" in order to make changes/improvements to their properties. This is primarily due to the increased cost associated with complying with City regs. While the proposed changes might effect resident safety (VERY important) I believe increased inspection costs will have a Negative effect on compliance.	Mar 12, 2010 10:43 PM
75	I'd be charged more for rent, and as a student, my dollars are already thin.	Mar 13, 2010 6:57 PM
76	As an owner who has a property that I currently could get \$100 - \$150 more per month and you raise the license renewal fees, etc., I will pass that on to the tenant. The current tenant is a good tenant in that he pays his rent on time, etc., however, not sure how much a hardship it would be on him to pay the additional rent I would have to charge.	Mar 14, 2010 2:25 AM
77	I don't think the landlord will recoup this cost in rent, however, once every four years is a reasonable cost.	Mar 14, 2010 8:19 PM
78	Before, no inspection was necessary for a license renewal. I've had the required inspection, and don't need any more.	Mar 15, 2010 6:51 AM
79	As a resident and property owner on the Hill, the higher the costs for rental licensing, the fewer rental property owners you will have admitting that they are renting out their homes, or part of their homes. You already have hundreds of residential property's being rented out who you are not overseeing. This makes it difficult on the rest of the single family occupied ownerships when properties rent out with no regards for the rules.	Mar 17, 2010 12:06 AM
80	Negative in the sense that you betcha the costs will be passed on to the renters. You can't expect property owners to subsidize the program, especially since no evidence has been presented that the current system is in need of fixing. The proposed changes look to a lot of people like a solution in search of a problem.	Mar 18, 2010 12:26 AM
81	Why don't you inspect my neighbors house, there is a better chance that you will find some code violation there.	Mar 18, 2010 1:00 AM
82	As an owner, I would do everything possible to pass the additional cost onto tenants. This is an extremely bad time in our economy to increase costs of anything for owners and/or tenants.	Mar 18, 2010 1:42 AM
83	Increased costs cannot necessarily be passed on to tenants. Rental rates are not based on cost.	Mar 18, 2010 1:51 AM
84	This will have to be passed on, if expensive costs are added.	Mar 18, 2010 1:58 AM
85	The owner/operator isn't going to absorb anything other than pay the bill originally. Of course the entire cost of the program is going to be passed on to the tenant. Even as a landlord, I think the rental rates for living in Boulder are ridiculous already and you are just making them worse.	Mar 18, 2010 2:17 AM

Please let us know if you have any additional thoughts about this question:		
86	Renters won't pay more in rent to cover the additional cost.	Mar 18, 2010 2:27 AM
87	N/A	Mar 18, 2010 3:51 AM
88	Any cost the city imposes, naturally jacks up rent rates which are already pushed way up in Boulder. Renters are normally the least able to afford such burdens, yet they will get whacked by the increases in costs which will push rents. Many landlords now publish info to tenants telling how much their cost of living is driven by City fees and other charges.	Mar 18, 2010 6:27 AM
89	Our economy is reeling; now is NOT the time to be increasing fees.	Mar 18, 2010 7:28 AM
90	It will definitely make renting more expensive, in a town where renting is already astronomically expensive. However, human health is worth it.	Mar 19, 2010 12:04 AM
91	These increases will need to be passed on in the form of higher rents. For a city that is concerned with "affordable" housing this is just more upward pressure on costs of living in Boulder. I don't wish to raise rent but as with any business, these kinds of costs need to be recovered.	Mar 19, 2010 2:44 AM
92	The city is putting too many extra costs on landlords. The assumption that rents can be raised in this current economic climate is incorrect. Times have changed for rentals in Boulder, there are more on the market and rents are stagnant or down. As mentioned above, many people who are property owners are supplementing income (earned or retirement), we are not all millionaire slum lords or something like that. rather we are law abiding citizens trying to make ends meet and manage our investments wisely and plan for retirement. The city's actions seem hostile and unnecessarily intrusive.	Mar 19, 2010 3:47 AM
93	My units are renting for less now, than 10 years ago. My property taxes are almost doubled in that time. With the effects of the City Council's stated " goal " for 10 % of the city's rental units to be affordable and other affordable " programs , what has happened , to a degree , have resulted in " Rent Control " 10 % of a market is more than enough to control the market . If the City bought or attempted to buy 10% of a " listed " company , they would have to file with the SEC . We are in very bad economic times right now , but the pattern for small lanlords has been going on for years . It could be soon , mom + pop lanlords will be a thing of the past .	Mar 19, 2010 4:53 AM
94	Pontentially passed on. Give me a break. The market determines rent. That is why most families rent in Superior and other places outside of Boulder.	Mar 19, 2010 10:52 PM
95	The increased cost of a rental license will have nothing whatsoever to do with how much rent an owner can charge. The rental market determines that, and no one can predict the future of our economy. I have owned rental since 2001 and have spent thousands of dollars out of other income (NOT rental income) to support the rentals I have owned. Now that I can begin to have some rental income for maintenance costs (NOT personal income), this new "green" program imposed by the city will be too costly for me. I will instead sell the last remaining rental I have in the City of Boulder.	Mar 20, 2010 2:38 AM

## Housing and Rental Licensing Code Changes Survey

Do you feel the above summary of potential code/program changes address your Housing and Rental Licensing Code concerns?				
	Yes	No	Rating Average	Response Count
What do you think?	29.1% (37)	70.9% (90)	1.71	127
If you answered no, please explain how your concerns could be addressed:				91
<i>answered question</i>				127
<i>skipped question</i>				9

If you answered no, please explain how your concerns could be addressed:		
1	I probably ought to actually go read the regs. The above summary is a touch vague.	Mar 8, 2010 7:32 AM
2	There has been talk of energy audits and mandated energy upgrades, and this survey focuses on "life safety" issues. As usual, the city charts a course and creates a push poll to try and support its misguided agenda.	Mar 8, 2010 10:36 AM
3	My concerns are why does Boulder have a licensing program at all? Most other communities do not have one and seem to do just fine. This whole thing is just another way to justify more government control and less individual freedom.	Mar 8, 2010 11:31 AM
4	1.) So many aspects of a home's safety are affected by a tenant's actions. 2.) There is already a system in place to address the safety of a property. 3.) If there are units that are "dangerous", tenants have the right to not rent a property that is not maintained well at the outset.	Mar 8, 2010 2:11 PM
5	There is enough of a burden on property owners as it now stands. Adding to it only adds to their cost and passed on to the renters. How many problems are there now?	Mar 8, 2010 2:44 PM
6	I think the land lord might have to make the heating more efficient. Maybe change the windows.	Mar 8, 2010 2:46 PM
7	While the above changes will help to begin to address major concerns, still more needs to be done to bring hundreds of rental units up to par, especially student rental housing. Landlords are allowed to skirt the rules and leave problems unaddressed for too long, and this a serious concern.	Mar 8, 2010 3:41 PM
8	I'm not concerned and do not find the changes of value	Mar 8, 2010 4:06 PM
9	Rental property energy efficiency standards are clearly needed and were not addressed in this survey. Hopefully future surveys will address this important step required to reduce Boulder's carbon emissions.	Mar 8, 2010 4:09 PM
10	We should have more focus on disclosure and lease term enclosure rather than inspection and rental licensing.	Mar 8, 2010 4:23 PM
11	I had no concerns	Mar 8, 2010 4:24 PM
12	The concerns that I have about renters is that the properties be properly maintained and in good condition, not having paint falling off, fences falling over, and weeds all over the property, which decreases property values in a neighborhood and is not fair to renters either.	Mar 8, 2010 4:39 PM
13	I think government needs to get out of our lives	Mar 8, 2010 4:55 PM

If you answered no, please explain how your concerns could be addressed:		
14	Although the survey addresses the proposed changes the level of ambiguity in the questions themselves and the reportable scales leave open the possibility of inaccurate reporting. Also given that these questions address issues of effectiveness for regulations that are already in place begs the question of why is the planing board even considering the implementation of this program, when enforcement would address many of the problems listed in this survey	Mar 8, 2010 4:55 PM
15	No answer. I felt the current licensing system was adequate. The new proposals seem reasonable, though.	Mar 8, 2010 5:03 PM
16	Maybe, but I already do this. Thee should be no added costs for signle family dwellings. Most of your new regs affect the multiunits.	Mar 8, 2010 5:28 PM
17	Need more on essential items such as screens, screen doors, hazard trees, and the types of items that out-of-state landlords and minimal minded property mgmt companies are likely not to address.	Mar 8, 2010 5:29 PM
18	I am extremely concerned about the upcoming energy change proposal.	Mar 8, 2010 5:35 PM
19	The licensing process is already too confusing and you want to add another component to that.	Mar 8, 2010 5:46 PM
20	We continue to be annoyed by neighboring renters whose landlords are unresponsive or unavailable for complaints about loud noise or yard parties. If you want to increase a regulation, why not make landlords accountable for their tenants' continual noise? They profit from the tenants, and don't have to tolerate the annoyance. I wish there were a "hotline" where I could file formal complaints about tenants according to the address, with landlords required to respond.	Mar 8, 2010 5:50 PM
21	As I said above, the only random inspections that would be remotely useful are for BBQ's on balconies. The owner is already required to have an inspection every 2 years that covers pretty much all items that a landlord should be responsible for. My inspector covered pretty much everything listed above (and more).	Mar 8, 2010 5:51 PM
22	The above items are common sense issues. They will not effect me since my property is in compliance at present. Safety issues are no brainers. What it does not address is the invasive plans to require replacement of good functional appliances and furnaces for minimal gain. Let the renters choose where they will live and whether they are willing to pay a premium for the so-called "Green Appliances". Let the market sort it out and keep government's hands out of it. There are a lot of other more effective places to start with the dubious control of greenhouse gases. This whole affair is ill-concieved and distorted in its implimentation. Boulder need a bit of reality rather than nebulous ideology	Mar 8, 2010 5:52 PM
23	I'm competing against an unlicensed market that doesn't have the costs I have so the can keep rents lower than I can	Mar 8, 2010 5:57 PM
24	The overall cost of the SmartReg program to the community will not be worth the "unproven benefit" so it is a major mistake. Property owners CANNOT control the behavior of their tenants so making property owners spend thousands of dollars is going to be a waste of money. A recession this is not the time to be making questionable changes that will could cost people thousands of dollars - this is fiscally irresponsible!	Mar 8, 2010 6:20 PM
25	You only talk about adding to the existing program at a greater cost. There is no chance to look at what is currently not working and should be discontinued at potential savings. This is not about program effectiveness, it is about program growth.	Mar 8, 2010 6:29 PM

If you answered no, please explain how your concerns could be addressed:		
26	As a renter, I guess I don't have a very good idea of how all of these changes will really affect me, but I feel that property management companies and landlords in boulder do a fairly good job of maintain safe living environments. Granted, they may not be perfectly maintained and are perhaps outrageously priced for the quality of the living environment, but I do not think it is necessary for the state/county to get more involved in checking up on landlords unless it has already been demonstrated that landlords are not fulfilling their responsibilities. Especially for property management companies with a proven record of compliance to housing codes, this is a big waste of time and money. Boulder county can find better things to spend its money on.	Mar 8, 2010 6:32 PM
27	You have apparently given little thought to the difference between multi-unit rental complexes with no owner or adult presence, and the small, owner-occupied, single-unit rentals which are common in Boulder.  See comments above	Mar 8, 2010 6:43 PM
28	--tenant education and responsibility is not addressed	Mar 8, 2010 6:45 PM
29	Its not a matter of life safety, but my unit has single pane windows, thus making my unit very expensive to heat during the winter. I think that it should be code to have at the very minimum, double paned glass.	Mar 8, 2010 6:45 PM
30	I didn't have concerns about these items. I keep my property in tip-top shape.	Mar 8, 2010 6:59 PM
31	These proposed changes are seriously unbalanced. In many cases they levy changes on property owners that are poorly construed and inefficient and so serve only to promulgate further beaurocracy into the system. This, in turn, drives up already high rental prices to the disservice of renters and the community at large. Property owners themselves do not subscribe to most of these proposals in their own homes.	Mar 8, 2010 7:03 PM
32	Reduce city intervention unless there is a legitimate complaint by a renter.	Mar 8, 2010 7:06 PM
33	Stop trying to baby sit every tiny little thing having to do with someone's personal property and a contract (lease) between two parties.	Mar 8, 2010 7:19 PM
34	I think having safety standards is great, but I feel some of theses issues cause further concern and hassle for those who are already in willing compliance.	Mar 8, 2010 7:25 PM
35	There are far more problems with the rental code than are being addressed here.	Mar 8, 2010 7:36 PM
36	I don't really have any concerns.	Mar 8, 2010 7:40 PM
37	Not at all. There are much bigger problems with the rental licensing program- as I mentioned earlier, the biggest problem is the number of illegal rental units in Boulder. They violate safety, zoning, codes, fair housing laws, and cause a substantial loss of revenue to the City. This ought to be first priority.	Mar 8, 2010 7:56 PM
38	I'm most concerned with the possible use of the licensing program, which was designed to regulate safety issues, being used to implement social-engineering goals. (namely the Climate Action Plan) It seems unfair that the City is focusing on just landlords at this point, arguably *because* we have an easy to administer mechanism (rental licenses) for enforcement.	Mar 8, 2010 8:03 PM
39	I found it difficult to follow all of the information as laid out on the <a href="http://www.bouldercolorado.gov/smartregs">www.bouldercolorado.gov/smartregs</a> website - couldn't this be put into one document? It would be much easier to sort it out if you didn't have to guess which document something was in.	Mar 8, 2010 8:09 PM
40	The city council and its advisors need to take a basic course in market based economics.	Mar 8, 2010 8:15 PM
41	The city needs to be very careful when adding regulations to anything. Regulations usually mean additional costs and time to the parties involved, and that has a huge impact on the way things get done in Boulder. As for rentals I see the additional regulations not as being "smart", but as controlling, with the potential of more illegal rentals coming on the market.	Mar 8, 2010 8:19 PM
42	I don't have any concerns.	Mar 8, 2010 8:49 PM



If you answered no, please explain how your concerns could be addressed:		
43	You keep adding more regulations and rules to make it difficult for the owners. Why don't you get rid of some rules or simplify them? You are just trying to add insurance to your jobs!	Mar 8, 2010 9:12 PM
44	I have no issues with my rental and do not want to see anything that would cause additional expenses.	Mar 9, 2010 12:07 AM
45	The rental licensing is understaffed and overworked as it is. I don't see how this is going to be paid for ... in this budget crisis.. without raising fees to the point where we can not afford to do business in the City of Boulder.	Mar 9, 2010 12:22 AM
46	I don't have any concerns. My apartments are already pretty good.	Mar 9, 2010 1:12 AM
47	We don't need more regulations. We need a smaller less intrusive government. Most cities do not involve themselves in private business like the City of Boulder.	Mar 9, 2010 1:44 AM
48	I think most of this is overkill.	Mar 9, 2010 2:26 AM
49	I understood that a package of energy efficiency improvements would be required as well. Not addressed on the current web site or within this survey. What's the proposal?	Mar 9, 2010 2:31 AM
50	Smart regs should be uniformly applied to all housing in the city, including owner occupied housing. When city council members recognize the difficulty and resistance this would create, they would then understand how unfair it is to only apply the regs to rental properties.	Mar 9, 2010 3:14 AM
51	is there a problem being addressed? are people being hurt because these proposed rules are not being followed?	Mar 9, 2010 4:58 AM
52	The concern is the energy efficiency upgrades proposed. This is already having an adverse effect on rental property values and sales in Boulder. These costs will be extraordinary.	Mar 9, 2010 3:02 PM
53	I don't understand the intent of this question	Mar 9, 2010 3:29 PM
54	Owners cannot control a tenant's behavior, and rentals are a small percentage of the situation.	Mar 9, 2010 4:40 PM
55	I would not have known about this survey if I hadn't happened on an article in the newspaper. How about mailing notices to people that actually hold rental licenses and would be impacted by the changes to inform them of these proposed changes and opportunities to give you feedback.	Mar 9, 2010 9:17 PM
56	I think the rental license program should be cancelled.	Mar 10, 2010 1:02 AM
57	I say no because I do not have such concerns. If there are issues, please enforce those statues and standards already in effect.	Mar 10, 2010 1:22 AM
58	Find a way to make licensing, including inspections, more streamlined and cost effective. Admittedly, it is quite simple to comply with the requirements. The licensing process is however, cumbersome and costly.	Mar 10, 2010 5:32 PM
59	Carbon footprint should be addressed with a point system. Houses with one story and proper roof overhangs, shade trees, no air conditioning except swamp coolers, no fireplace, no dogs allowed, outdoor clotheslines, vegetable and herb gardens should get points - not just your furnace rating, windows, etc.	Mar 11, 2010 1:07 AM
60	My concerns are too much regulation - always more - never less.	Mar 11, 2010 3:07 PM
61	My concerns are solely with how the proposed SmartRegs will increase costs to property owners. I believe the way to reduce energy costs is by educating renters and not by penalizing landlords.	Mar 11, 2010 4:58 PM
62	I fear increasing the bureaucracy of this program. Increasing safety for tenants, and keeping landlords responsive and responsible is a good thing, but go with kid gloves here, and don't discourage this important business that keeps Boulder's economy flourishing.	Mar 11, 2010 7:31 PM
63	My biggest concern with the Rental Licensing Code is that it drives up costs for landlords and/or tenants. Either way the result is additional cost. I think the present system is already doing a good job of ensuring the safety of tenants.	Mar 12, 2010 4:36 AM

If you answered no, please explain how your concerns could be addressed:		
64	Energy efficiency needs to be addressed. These homes and units are drafty, poorly insulated, and have outrageous energy bills. Property owners have no reason to invest in the energy efficiency of these homes/units, but neither do the students/renters (nor do they have the money).	Mar 12, 2010 4:45 AM
65	I thought this survey would have more to do with the possible requirements for landlords to make energy-efficient upgrades to their properties.	Mar 12, 2010 11:16 AM
66	Maybe I am mistaken but I was under the impression that there were code changes pending that had to do with Energy efficiency in rental properties. Am I answering the wrong survey???	Mar 12, 2010 10:43 PM
67	In my apartment complex, you can't read the building address from the street. This needs to be changed. I've talked to my landlord about it, but he hasn't done much to fix it. Is this a code violation?  My other concerns are addressed through this program.	Mar 13, 2010 6:57 PM
68	While I understand there should not be safety hazards in a rental property but that also includes owner occupied properties. I think you should incorporate all residential properties in the city of Boulder into this kind of inspection and regulation so that the property next door to my rental unit is as safe as my unit. What good is one condo in a complex being checked and rechecked when all the others are hazards?	Mar 14, 2010 2:25 AM
69	I thought there were going to be energy requirement. It would seem this would be incorporated at the same time.	Mar 14, 2010 8:19 PM
70	While these address some safety issues, we still need to address the climate action issues to increase home efficiency, which is much more important	Mar 14, 2010 11:09 PM
71	As I mentioned above, make the list, then let individuals monitor the items. The city/county government doesn't inspect every house in the city and county every four years to be sure that building codes and these kind of items are adhered to by the owners.	Mar 15, 2010 6:51 AM
72	You need to focus on enforcement of the basic need for rental properties to be licensed. Go to Craigs list for a start and begin doing a better job of getting compliance for licensing.	Mar 17, 2010 12:06 AM
73	The city is abusing it's power by putting including onerous and intrusive regulations into what was supposed to be a simple inspection for general liveability and safety. Can't trust ya!	Mar 17, 2010 11:42 PM
74	See comments above.	Mar 18, 2010 12:26 AM
75	You really don't want to hear what I have to say.	Mar 18, 2010 1:00 AM
76	I think NO CHANGES are required. The rental licensing program was reviewed a number of years ago and the current system was acceptable to all concerned. Owners/managers know what is required in the current rental licensing program which is adequate. Additions are NOT NECESSARY.	Mar 18, 2010 1:42 AM
77	I thought that the existing rental inspections did a good job of addressing safety issues, with the exception that I would add CO2 detectors to the list.	Mar 18, 2010 1:51 AM
78	This is bureaucratic. Please talk to Boulder Apartment Owners Association.	Mar 18, 2010 1:58 AM
79	I do not have any rental liscensing code concerns other than I believe the rental inspection program should be done away with entirely.	Mar 18, 2010 2:17 AM
80	I feel like the biggest issue is there just isn't enough enforcement. Random checks would help this.	Mar 18, 2010 3:27 AM
81	As someone who is familiar but not thoroughly knowledgeable about the Smart Regs issue, I found some of these questions unclear. Also, I was under the impression that the bulk of this issue was related to energy efficiency standards of rental properties.	Mar 18, 2010 3:51 AM

If you answered no, please explain how your concerns could be addressed:		
82	My concern is keeping government out of private business endeavors. This is the exact opposite. Thousands of legitimate communities with rental properties do not have government injected into private enterprise and they do just fine...the market operates and tenant will not buy substandard housing ... they will move on to more suitable living arrangements. This just hurts real estate owners, depresses real estate prices due to reduction in demand and forces poor tenants to pay ever more cost-push rent prices.	Mar 18, 2010 6:27 AM
83	Doesn't say who will do these things.	Mar 18, 2010 3:30 PM
84	I already check and/or correct these things. I am anxious to get on with the energy aspect of rental units.	Mar 18, 2010 10:03 PM
85	Many of the rental units are not energy efficient, and are dangerous to human health in other ways besides fire safety.	Mar 19, 2010 12:04 AM
86	As an owner/manager of our property I think that the current system should not be increased. In fact, if it were less difficult and costly to obtain a license, more owners would comply with rental licensing which would make the overall rental community safer and more affordable.	Mar 19, 2010 2:44 AM
87	My concerns are to have my rights as a business person protected. And my concerns are also to have my good efforts as a law abiding landlord who follows all the rules be recognized. Every time my properties are inspected I am told that the inspector has never seen a property so well maintained. I do it this way because it is the right way to do it. So how about adding incentives and rewards for land owners who never have to make any upgrades, repairs, or improvements to get their license because they've already gone above and beyond?	Mar 19, 2010 3:47 AM
88	I'm concerned that the new " smart regs " might mandate , large and expensive repairs or updates that I can't afford and that no money is included to help pay for it .	Mar 19, 2010 4:53 AM
89	How much higher will ther permits go?	Mar 19, 2010 8:29 PM
90	What about the energy efficiency proposals?	Mar 19, 2010 10:52 PM
91	I am not concerned about the life-safety requirements that you have outlined in this survey. My rental already meets these requirements.	Mar 20, 2010 2:38 AM

## Housing and Rental Licensing Code Changes Survey

Please provide any comments, thoughts or feedback not covered in the above questions.		
		Response Count
		74
	<b>answered question</b>	<b>74</b>
	<b>skipped question</b>	<b>62</b>

Response Text		
1	Try a survey not a push poll	Mar 8, 2010 10:36 AM
2	If you eliminated the extra electric used by all the pot growing operations, these new energy regulations would be unnecessary. It is the tenants, not the landlords who waste energy. the only real way to adjust tenants behavior is to make the utilities more expensive, so individuals turn down the heat. How many times do you see dorm rooms (where energy is free), with open windows in the middle of the winter? Here come the green police.	Mar 8, 2010 11:31 AM
3	Responsible property owners will not object to the above changes, but it is clear that enough concern exists to establish & enforce such codes.	Mar 8, 2010 2:34 PM
4	The city of Boulder already has pretty strict regulations for rental properties, much more than other communities.	Mar 8, 2010 2:44 PM
5	Please make the changes!	Mar 8, 2010 4:05 PM
6	We should have more focus on disclosure and lease term enclosure rather than inspection and rental licensing. Let's focus on informing tenants and letting adults make decisions for themselves! MDU safety I see as a genuine need - but the real safety issues may be tenant behavior more than owner accountable inspections.	Mar 8, 2010 4:23 PM
7	Leave this law alone. Now is not the time. If we were in an economic upswing, MAYBE this law would make sense, but now, this law is truly a stupid idea that costs a lot of money when the economy is bad.	Mar 8, 2010 4:39 PM
8	As the housing stock ages, there is potential for more safety hazards, especially in rentals. Much of the inventory is now 40-50 years old or more, faulty wiring(aluminum, old lower amp panels, non grounded receptacles, too few outlets hence lots of extension chords) aging appliances and over loading of supply have added greatly to the potential of hazards. One of the criteria for new appliances would be for safety, not just energy efficiency. Caution needs to be observed in pushing landlords to spending too much on conservation, when in fact the tenants are often irresponsible in their consumption and behavior patterns.	Mar 8, 2010 4:54 PM
9	All this will do is force some landlords to raise the rent or sell their property	Mar 8, 2010 4:55 PM
10	You would do much more if you required that the landlord show the average monthly cost for utilities over the past 12 months of occupancy to any potential renter. Now most renters have no idea of the true cost of renting. This would provide incentives to landlords to upgrade energy and water conservation. See Daily Camera letters to the editor 3/8/2010	Mar 8, 2010 5:28 PM
11	The results of the carbon reduction scheme is overstated. Reductions in emissions will be minimal at best and at worst they will artificially increase rental prices and the price of multi-family real estate in Boulder. If the city is serious about creating affordable living in the city this goes against that idea.	Mar 8, 2010 5:46 PM

Response Text		
12	The format of this survey is horrible. Heaven forbid that you even TRY to write an even-handed, unbiased survey. The questions basically try to force a pre-conceived outcome.	Mar 8, 2010 5:51 PM
13	I attended the meeting where the concept of the smart regs was laid out. I was particularly offended by the suggestion that a landlord could buy carbon offsets if he could not afford the mandated replacement of furnaces and appliances. How stupid do you really think we are? Buying indulgences is a scam and does not begin to address the purpose of the program. If indulgences are necessary, the plan is majorly flawed. It would be much better to phase in more energy efficient appliances as they are naturally replaced. This would make sense in the area of conservation and sanity. And those who think they are saving the planet from greenhouse gasses can also be somewhat placated. I am not suggesting that we can't improve, but use a scapel instead of an ax. Plowing through like a bull in a china shop is sure to have many unintended consequences. Just observe what Boulder's refusal to let some businesses, which are deemed beneath our dignity, has done to our tax base. At present a large number of people who work in Boulder can't afford to live here. Just observe the Boulder Turnpike (36) in the morning and evening. This plan will undoubtedly add to that problem. As the traffic increases, how good will you feel about your suppression of the rental market in Boulder? How much have you then reduced the carbon emmisions? I submit that you will have exacerbadated them. Don't try to ply your hobby on the backs of those who try to provide housing to renters. You will not like the results.	Mar 8, 2010 5:52 PM
14	Please get every rental in town on the same page (licensed) before you impose penalties on them. All or none	Mar 8, 2010 5:57 PM
15	SMARTREGS - makes me think of Orwell's 1984. Or that the city has already made up it's mind. More regulation will always be more expense to the customer.	Mar 8, 2010 6:02 PM
16	NEXT TIME DESIGN A NEUTRAL POLL!!!!!! Push polling is disgusting and destroys any belief that you are a neutral organization. You are not trying to get community input, you are trying to justify the plans that you will push through regardless of the community. Do NOT grow the department. Do NOT bloat the process with useless actions and data collection.	Mar 8, 2010 6:29 PM
17	Based on extensive, and discouraging, experience with Boulder City staff, I have no expectation that any comments, from any one, will have any impact on the direction that staff has chosen.  These regulations will be passed by Council, as proposed, and they will be added to the many useless and incomprehensible existing layers of regulation already in effect in Boulder.	Mar 8, 2010 6:43 PM
18	If the inspection fees are going up, I would suggest increasing the license term to 5 years.	Mar 8, 2010 6:59 PM
19	There are certain Boulder ordinances regarding rental property that fine the property owners rather than the renters who caused the violations. One example is snow removal after a storm. I believe the property resident should be fined directly for a violation. This puts the the onus on the party most directly responsible and, being on the scene, most knowledgeable of the violation. Rental property leases are written that way and should be similarly treated by the city.	Mar 8, 2010 7:03 PM
20	These interventions and intrusions are not really addressing safety problems. Education would be a more effective approach if the city wants to spend money.	Mar 8, 2010 7:06 PM
21	No one earning less than \$50-60,000/year (single person) will be able to live in Boulder as the rents will go way up to cover the cost of all this.	Mar 8, 2010 7:08 PM

Response Text		
22	<p>The rents in Boulder are so high now that a lot of people are priced out. If the city keeps adding on more and more sets of hoops to jump through a few things will happen:</p> <p>The rent for those dwellings whose owners continue to obey the law of licensing will jump to not only encompass the increased fees from the city, but the costs incurred to comply with the new requirements.</p> <p>The number of unlicensed rentals will sky rocket with a basement apartment in every home in Martin Acres.</p> <p>Due to the increased rent prices, the number of people living at one residence will rise. If you start sticking 4 students in a one bedroom apartment, how do you think that wil affect the potential fire hazard?</p>	Mar 8, 2010 7:19 PM
23	I have had tenants have \$400 a month heating bills. You cannot regulate conservation. I live above that unit in a place almost twice as big, and my heating bills are less than \$35 a month because I conserve energy. Forcing me to spend thousands of dollars so careless wasteful tenants save money makes no sense to me. People need to take responsibility for their own behavior and saving them money will not stop their wasteful behavior.	Mar 8, 2010 7:19 PM
24	As an owner of a condo in a mostly renter occupied environment (Wimbledon Condos at 30th and Colorado) I fully support these new regulations and they will add the safety of the environment and to the value of my home!	Mar 8, 2010 7:23 PM
25	I think the city would be better served by enforcing the program, especially in large buildings and complexes, where renters are most likely to be living and that compliance and enforcement could be more successful if addressed, at least partially, through the homeowner's associations.	Mar 8, 2010 7:25 PM
26	This is a very disappointing survey and the revisions seem namby-pamby.	Mar 8, 2010 7:36 PM
27	I'm not sure why the rental market is being targeted with this program. Why not require home sellers to go through an inspection process to ensure that the home is up to code and issue an occupancy permit when all violations have been corrected?	Mar 8, 2010 7:40 PM
28	Do something about all the illegal rentals in the City before taking on new programs. A few years ago there were just a few, and now there are now hundreds of illegal unlicensed rentals in the City. Boulder has the reputation that its better not to get a rental license because you fly under the radar and will not be subject to the all the regulations, costs, and fees involved with having a rental license. Its not fair to the rest of use that follow the rules.	Mar 8, 2010 7:56 PM
29	It is important to remember that the more onerous the licensing system becomes, the more people will elect to ignore it and rent unlicensed units. In this case, the life-safety situation will probably deteriorate overall.	Mar 8, 2010 8:03 PM
30	I think the energy efficiency part of the changes is going to put undue burdens on rental owners. I agree with the merits of making houses more efficient, but you have to realize that most of the rental properties near campus in Boulder were built in the 1950's or earlier, and this could cost owners a lot of money in upgrades.	Mar 8, 2010 8:09 PM
31	The city council and its advisors need to take a basic course in market based economics.	Mar 8, 2010 8:15 PM
32	If the regulations are too strict the single family rentals will suffer. It may be easier for landlords to sell the property than comply with updating and old property. The newer multi-unit properties will comply with these regulations easily, because they will comply with more modern building codes, or have the potential to re-coup the cost of upgrading. Sometimes the best thing to do is let the market dictate what is needed beyond basic safety issues.	Mar 8, 2010 8:19 PM
33	I was surprised, I though that this was going to be more environmental things, instead, they are safety concerns that a smart renter would address anyway. It would be good to have them required.	Mar 8, 2010 8:20 PM

Response Text		
34	It would be nice if changes were approached from a "carrot" rather than a "stick" point of view.	Mar 8, 2010 8:49 PM
35	Thanks for asking; could I be any more negative? Rules, rules, rules...job insurance, job insurance. The city should leave rental properties alone. What don't you get it? You certainly haven't made substantial improvement for the owner or the renter since you began licensing. All you have done is become a thorn in our sides and generated revenue for yourselves.	Mar 8, 2010 9:12 PM
36	I am more concerned about increasing energy efficiency of all rental housing. some incentives might be helpful to help this occur. An idea: allow currently illegal rental housing to become legal if sufficient upgrades are done.	Mar 8, 2010 9:22 PM
37	Please explain what the "complaint-based" enforcement system means. I is not clear in this survey or in the Daily Camera.	Mar 8, 2010 10:09 PM
38	<p>The questions only asked if these changes would have an effect. Well, if you add restrictions/mandates to the law and then city inspectors perform audits, of Course it will have an effect. However, the question was not asked as to whether or not these changes are practical and manageable and feasible for the common renter/property owner.</p> <p>Not that I have too much to say on that, as I have little experience, but this survey is incomplete and runs risk of being naive to not ask questions about practicality. Of course taking measures to enact and reinforce changes will have an effect. This survey seems biased.</p> <p>But its all good steps, thanks for stepping them.</p>	Mar 8, 2010 11:46 PM
39	I have no issues with my rental and do not want to see anything that would cause additional expenses.	Mar 9, 2010 12:07 AM
40	We strive to provide a safe and affordable house for rental. We have actively complied with the current rental licensing and support reasonable safety standards. We barely cover the mortgage payment with the rent we currently charge. We strongly feel that the environment in Boulder is moving strongly against business and the individual home owner. You can't keep adding rules and regulations every year without a stifling effect on small property owners.	Mar 9, 2010 12:22 AM
41	<p>Is there research that the items being inspected are the top cause of safety issues and incidents in rental units?</p> <p>What are the specifics for porches and decks? Does it use current code or that consistent with when the property was built? It would not be fair to have increased costs.</p>	Mar 9, 2010 1:23 AM
42	The current license inspections are overkill already.	Mar 9, 2010 1:44 AM
43	You are driving good owners out of business --- let's see how well you do when the city has to provide tons of rental housing.	Mar 9, 2010 2:26 AM
44	It should also be noted that rental housing is one of the biggest economic engines in the city and these regs inhibit the growth of this important economic sector, thereby hurting the city revenues as a whole.	Mar 9, 2010 3:14 AM
45	random checks will make landlords comply with existing rules (e.g. number unrelated persons per unit, fire alarms etc.) which i generally agree with.	Mar 9, 2010 4:58 AM
46	This questionnaire does not address the real concern about the proposals.	Mar 9, 2010 3:02 PM
47	we need to reduce our homes carbon footprint even if we dont reside in them.	Mar 9, 2010 3:11 PM
48	Safety revisions are fine... Do not make them complaint base or random,,Make them part of the licence renewal process...	Mar 9, 2010 3:29 PM
49	When laws are flaunted it makes those who are law abiding resistant to new requirements. Owners provide a service to the community, please stop making this less and less attractive to provide.	Mar 9, 2010 4:40 PM

Response Text		
50	Most rental owners are small business people, and contrary to popular belief are not making a killing renting property in Boulder. The cost of real estate, taxes, utilities and all the regulations being piled on by the city are taking properties that barely broke even into losing money, and most of us can't afford to lose money. Last year I lost a months rent for installing backflow prevention devices mandated by Boulder and now have to pay for an annual inspection on that also. The proposed efficiency requirements are yet another expense to be borne by small business people like myself that comes out of my pocket and will have to be passed to tenants. Why would you place requirements on small businesses that can't afford it? I haven't seen a proposal requiring other homeowners who don't rent their property to implement efficiency upgrades. Why not, since their property is no different than mine - oh wait - they would complain about government interfering with their property rights and unfunded mandates - yet you seem to be perfectly willing to do that to rental property owners. If you really want a green Boulder then you need to make rental housing affordable so that people don't have to commute into Boulder - adding burdensome regulations will only drive renters out of Boulder as rents go up.	Mar 9, 2010 9:17 PM
51	I again ask, what problems are you trying to solve? and are those problems already addressed by existing laws, systems, and standards?	Mar 10, 2010 1:22 AM
52	I have decided to be a small-scale rental property owner to provide for future financial security for myself and my family. As a fire fighter in Boulder County wanting to live near my place of work, I believe it will be a good way to supplement my long-term future income. At the moment, they mostly 'pay for themselves' with the addition of my time and labor. I have always taken care of my tenants. I have always happily addressed there concerns, whether major or minor. As such, additional costs and requirements will not affect the quality or safety of my rental properties.	Mar 10, 2010 5:32 PM
53	If safety is your concern, then propose incentives to property owners. Do not penalize us b/c some idiot lit up Gold Run after partying in the front yard. It seems to me that money is all you're after.	Mar 10, 2010 8:09 PM
54	We need a big educational component for both renters and landlords. The Xcel energy bill for the previous three years should be provided in the lease, also emergency city phone numbers, an overview of city ordinances - noise, garbage, occupancy. A fridge magnet on how to save energy and water and reduce your carbon footprint. I have a degree in Environmental Studies and could write this.	Mar 11, 2010 1:07 AM
55	The proposed SmartRegs are discriminatory against "landlords" (I own a grand total of one small rental house in Martin Acres, which I've had for more than 30 years) because we are seen as politically-incorrect, and detached enough to be vulnerable to "divide and conquer" and "done deal politics" in Boulder. If the SmartRegs were being proposed for ALL properties in Boulder, at one time, that would be another matter -- but noooo, that would never fly, so I view this entire exercise as "let's stick it to the landlords." I am an environmentalist but I believe the City should provide incentives for people to do what it wants, not bully tactics. It's not fair to force landlords to retrofit their properties to some lofty but arbitrary standard, and I believe it is disingenuous (at best) to claim that doing so will "increase property values" and will "increase rents enough to cover the costs of the retrofit." Really? -- then Council should be required to retrofit all their own homes before forcing its opinions on the rest of us. If the City wants us to conform, it should pay for the cost of an energy audit on every property, and then devise a scale for how much retrofitting is recommended, and offer an incentive plan to encourage people to conform. More carrots, fewer hammers, please.	Mar 11, 2010 4:58 PM
56	I'm supportive of your intention to upgrade energy efficiency in rental units, good luck.	Mar 11, 2010 7:31 PM
57	I hope you will provide estimates of the actual costs before you send out the survey on energy efficiency changes to the Code!!!	Mar 12, 2010 4:36 AM



Response Text		
58	Per my response to number 7, I was disappointed that this was not covered. I agree with the comments made by Sheila Horton in the Daily Camera. Why are the rental properties being targeted? Why don't all these potential requirements for energy-efficient upgrades be applied across the board to all properties in Boulder?!?	Mar 12, 2010 11:16 AM
59	As you work at involving more and more regulations on people who own rental properties in the City of Boulder the people who cannot or don't care to own properties in the city and instead wish to rent are going to find themselves trying to balance increased rents against living in Boulder at all. While a large percentage of residents of Boulder rent rather than own property that has been brought about by the price of property and now it will be restricting the ability of renters to even rent property. If this is your goal you will certainly reach it quickly. The carbon footprint of a residential property is pretty small compared to those of the commercial buildings, lets work on them as well and quickly.	Mar 14, 2010 2:25 AM
60	To set up a government complaint department sounds like you are opening a book you don't want to read. You are soliciting the minority that have nothing better to do but complain. The intelligent tenant just moves. As you sow shall you reap works quiet well. I don't know how you will teach that.	Mar 14, 2010 8:19 PM
61	Please back off. We just don't need more and more government in our lives.	Mar 15, 2010 6:51 AM
62	The more regulations you place on landlords, the more rent increases we will see in the City. These costs will be passed through to the renters. This will only end up forcing more and more renters who are not from wealthy families to live in cheaper communities nearby who will then be driving in and out of our city which makes our transportation situation worse. This is at odds with trying to incourange affordable rental housing for the Boulder City masses that rent. And for most of us who have to use our cars every day to accomplish what we need to do in the City, you make road congestion worse. You are not really thinking of the very big picture.	Mar 17, 2010 12:06 AM
63	The more I read about your programs the more I feel like I'm being harrassed because I own rental property. If you need to justify your jobs try some other approach like harrassing everyone equally. That includes every homeowner in Boulder not just the owners of rental property. Since you asked.	Mar 18, 2010 1:00 AM
64	"If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Leave well enough alone.	Mar 18, 2010 1:42 AM
65	Any extensive costs to upgrade green issues has to be sculpted so that the owners can be subsidized by the utilities or others, preferably not the renters.	Mar 18, 2010 1:58 AM
66	The city would be better served by the issuance of a set of recommended guidelines and the listing of mandated state law requirements regarding rental units to landlords. What liability is the city taking on with the proposed program and the rest of the program in general if there is an incident involving a recently inspected and passed unit that involves any of these items that the City had just deemed "safe". i.e the fire extinguisher is depleted by the tenant and not reported to owner, the carbon monoxide is unplugged/breaker is shut off by tenant so that it doesn't beep, an extension cord is overloaded and burns. The inspection by someone to certify that for that for one moment in time on one day every four years or even once a year that all was well is a waste of time and effort. Most landlords have an interest in their properties, and keep them safe as it is in their best interest to do so. There are always the outliers that any program is not really going to change on a permanant basis.	Mar 18, 2010 2:17 AM
67	The enerby factor is not going to help the rental market. You need to work on homeowners if you are going to effect renters.	Mar 18, 2010 2:27 AM

Response Text		
68	<p>From my experience as a renter in Boulder, I have found that the majority of property owners are very hands-off and are more interested in making money off of their renters than they are in ensuring that their property is inhabitable and supports a quality of life that they themselves would find satisfactory. "Energy efficiency" and "value" are two terms that are rarely discussed regarding many Boulder rental properties. I believe it is essential to hold property owners accountable for the properties they rent and require that they meet certain standards. Without delving too much into the social, demographic, and political aspects of this issue, it is important to note that some (but not all) property owners are profiting greatly at the expense of their tenants by refusing to upgrade or improve their properties, knowing that some fool will pay their high rent prices and utility bills while sacrificing proper insulation, fully functional appliances, effective heating/cooling systems, and the benefit of simple, cost-saving improvements. Property owners should be held accountable for installing and maintaining energy efficient appliances, windows, doors, insulation, and furnaces. If renters had enough cash to throw away on exorbitant utility bills they wouldn't be renting in the first place.</p>	Mar 18, 2010 3:51 AM
69	<p>There is a backlash in our society now regarding government intervention into private enterprise. This is a classic case. Governments that keep pushing this envelope will soon find themselves in an outdated posture which the general public strongly opposes. Government is broken and forcing even more on the proletariat is becoming an outdated concept which citizens are growing more and more sick of over time.</p>	Mar 18, 2010 6:27 AM
70	<p>You should be lowering costs, not increasing them - especially when our country is in such a horrible recession and people are struggling. Where is common sense being exhibited in the Boulder city government?</p>	Mar 18, 2010 7:28 AM
71	<p>I'm rather surprised at the emphasis on fire issues in this survey. It seems like it could be used as a mechanism to be big brother and peer into a property owner's business unnecessarily.</p>	Mar 19, 2010 12:04 AM
72	<p>Rental licensing is a program that was begun mainly to keep the rentals to college students up to code and improve safety for those renters. It has now grown and continues to grow beyond that. The result is increased costs to renters and owners that continue to make the city unaffordable for a large portion of people that would like to live here. Continue to enforce the rules that are already in place if safety is the goal.</p>	Mar 19, 2010 2:44 AM
73	<p>I was shocked during the open houses at how little the city employees really knew about the financial realities faced by landlords. I was outraged by the cavalier assumptions that all landlords maintain slum like conditions and that all landlords have tons of surplus money. Many of us are just trying to make ends meet and plan for children's college and retirement. I feel like my time and money are continually wasted by the inefficiencies of your planning processes and your lack of understanding of the full picture. Not all renters are victims. Many often destroy the property beyond belief and are incredibly dishonorable in fulfilling their commitments. It's fine to have a licensing program but make it simple and quit assuming that a raise in rent will cover all random costs the city decides to invent</p>	Mar 19, 2010 3:47 AM
74	<p>I am concerned that too much is expected of landlords . This plays well , politically in liberal Boulder , but paying for broad community goals should be shared by the whole community .</p>	Mar 19, 2010 4:53 AM